

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the Examiner must show that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143.

Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited above by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations as set forth in the present application. Specifically, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest "the opposing surface of the active matrix substrate and the opposing surface of the transparent substrate are treated so as to have the same orientation directions."

Okamoto discloses a conventional OCB type liquid crystal display device. However, Okamoto does not disclose that the orientation films on both sides of the liquid crystal layer are orientated so as to have the same direction. The Examiner also relies on Miyazaki. However, Miyazaki merely discloses a TN-LCD (twist nematic liquid crystal display device), and does not discuss an OCB type liquid crystal display device. As a result, Miyazaki does not disclose that the orientation films on both sides of the liquid crystal layer are orientated so as to have the same direction. Therefore, neither cited reference discloses or suggests orienting the opposing orientation films in the same orientation direction.

Col. 12
lines
26, 29

Furthermore, with respect to claim 2, the cited references are also silent with respect to teaching or suggesting that the signal lines extend along the long side direction of the pixel region. The Examiner relies on the Okamoto reference to allegedly teach the structure of OCB type liquid crystal displays. However, as the Examiner acknowledges, Okamoto fails to disclose that the signal-lines extend along the long side direction of the pixel region. See Office Action, page 3. For this features, the Examiner relies on the teaching of Miyazawa.

However, Miyazawa does not disclose that the signal lines extend in the long side direction of the pixel region. Furthermore, the Examiner does not explain where this claim recitation is contained in Miyazawa. The Examiner only argues that the signal lines extend along the pixel region but does not argue that the signal lines extend along the long side of the pixel region.

Such placement of the signal lines is neither arbitrary nor obvious. By having the signal lines extend in the long side direction, the electric field that is generated between the pixel electrode and signal lines will be parallel with the orientation of the liquid crystal molecules (since the molecules are oriented in the short side direction). By allowing the electric field to be parallel with the molecule orientation, twisting of the liquid crystal molecules is suppressed. Neither references recognizes nor teaches this feature. Therefore, the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitation of claims 1-9.

Finally, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must provide a convincing line of reasoning (by a preponderance of evidence) of why one skilled in the art would have found the combination of the teachings of the cited references obvious. See MPEP § 2143.01. Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited above by the Examiner fail to provide any suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of the references. Of the references cited by the Examiner, only Okamoto discusses an OCB type liquid crystal display device. All other cited references deal with different types of liquid crystal display devices (i.e. non-OCB type devices). The Examiner has not provided any explanation of how or why the teachings and/or features of non-OCB type devices can be utilized to modify an OCB type

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Appln. No.: 09/735,907

Attorney Docket No.: Q62301


device. Since the Examiner has failed to provide any convincing line of reasoning for why the teachings and/or features of non-OCB type devices can be utilized to modify an OCB type device, the Examiner has failed to meet his burden of properly establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. Whitehead
Registration No. 48,071

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 5, 2003